

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 8 have been amended in a readily apparent manner to overcome the objections to these claims. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Makino et al. (U.S. 2002/0008683). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a data scanning unit for scanning a plurality of times of first-half data scanings, and a plurality of consecutive second-half data scanings following the first-half data scanings within a predetermined period, as in claims 1 and 8. The reference also does not disclose (or suggest) turning on the light source after the first-half data scanings begin and turning off the light source before the second-half data scanings end.

The Makino et al. reference discloses a data scanning and back-light control method in which a frame is divided into a first sub-frame and a second sub-frame (see Fig. 33). Within each sub-frame, a data-writing scanning is performed in the first half, followed by a data-erasing scanning in the second half. Thus, the Makino et al. reference teaches performing a single scanning during the first-half of a predetermined period and another single scanning in the second-half of the period.

In contrast, a plurality of scanings are performed in the first-half of a predetermined period, followed by a plurality of consecutive scanings in the second-half of

the predetermined period in the present invention. See, for example, Fig. 10 of the subject application. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in Makino et al.

Moreover, the Makino et al. reference teaches that the back light is turned on exactly at the beginning of the scanning in the second-half of the sub-frame and turned off immediately at the end of the scanning in the first-half of the subsequent sub-frame. In contrast, the light source is turned on after the first-half data scanings begin and turned off before the second-half scanings end. The distinction between the two methods for turning the light on and off is readily apparent when comparing Fig. 33 of Makino et al. and Fig. 10 of the present application. For these reasons, independent claims 1 and 8, and their respective dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 are allowable over Makino et al.

Claims 3-7 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Makino et al. in view of Yoshihara et al. These claims depend from independent claims 1 or 8, and therefore, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above traversing the rejection of claims 1 and 8 based on Makino et al. alone.

For all of the forgoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.


Customer No. 24978

September 28, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\1100\69785\BT0119.DOC

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By: 
B. Joe Kim
Registration No. 41,895